

CHATHAM COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

ARTHUR A. MENDONSA HEARING ROOM

112 EAST STATE STREET

MAY 22, 2007

9:00 A.M.

MEETING

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

**Wayne Noha, Chairman
Terrence Murphy
Steven Day
Brian Felder
Jimmy Watford**

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Davis Cohen (Excused)

TECHNICAL STAFF ABSENT:

**Robert Sebek, Chatham County Inspections
Department**

MPC STAFF PRESENT:

**Deborah Burke, Assistant Secretary
Christy Adams, Administrative Assistant**

RE: Called to Order

Mr. Noha called the meeting of May 22, 2007 Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

RE: Regular Agenda

**RE: Continued Petition of Arend Jan deVoest
Poticny Deering Felder
B-070327-38478-1
1418 Walthour Road**

Mr. Felder recused himself from this petition as his firm are the architects for this petition.

Present for the petition was Brian Felder and Jan deVoest, Architects and Pat McCarthy, Owner.

Mrs. Burke gave the following Staff report.

The petition was continued from the April 24, 2007 meeting.

Nature of Request

The petitioner is requesting approval of a 1,283 square foot variance from the 900 square foot maximum for an accessory building per Section 3-6.1 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance

in order to construct an accessory structure. The subject property, located at 1418 Walthour Road, is zoned R-1-A/ EO (One-Family Residential/ Environmental Overlay).

Findings

1. Section 3-6.1 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance permits accessory buildings to be located outside of the rear yard where the property directly abuts a river or salt marsh with specific requirements. The requirements state that the accessory structure cannot exceed 900 square feet in size. The applicant is proposing a 2,183 square foot accessory structure.
2. Per the Tax Assessor's Office, the subject property is approximately 1.73 acres in size. The parcel is a conforming lot of record that far exceeds the minimal development standards of the Ordinance.
3. The petitioner is seeking a variance in order to construct a 2,183 square foot accessory structure located in the front of the subject property.
4. In accordance with Section 10-6.3 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance, the Board of Appeals may authorize upon appeal in specific cases such variance from the terms of the regulations as will not be contrary to the public interest where owing to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the provisions will, in an individual case, result in unnecessary hardship, so that the spirit of the regulations will be observed, public safety and welfare secured, and substantial justice done. Such variance may be granted in an individual case upon a finding by the Board of Appeals that:

- a. **There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property in question because of its size, shape, or topography.**

There are no extraordinary or exceptional conditions pertaining to the subject property. The subject property is a conforming lot of record that far exceeds the minimum requirements of the Ordinance. However, the request before the Board is not one, such as a setback variance, that would be impacted by the size or shape of the lot.

- b. **The application of these regulations to this particular piece of property would create an unnecessary hardship.**

Strict application of the regulations of the district would not cause an unnecessary hardship. However, the applicant would be limited to a 900 square foot accessory structure.

- c. **Such conditions are peculiar to the particular piece of property involved.**

The conditions described above are not peculiar to the subject property.

- d. **Relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good, or impair the purposes and intent of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance.**

Relief, if granted, would most likely not cause substantial detriment to the public good. However, the variance request would appear to be in conflict with the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance.

Summary of Findings

All of the conditions necessary for granting a 1,283 square foot area variance for an accessory use appear not to be met.

Mr. deVoe stated with the addition of the workshop it would be 11 percent lot coverage which would be a 3 percent increase. He showed the layout of the equipment that would be in the workshop.

Mr. Day stated there was considerable discussion last time about the need for such a large structure. He said the ordinance says that you could only have a 900 square foot structure. He said the Board has granted variances in other situations. He said he felt the major concern was why the need for such a large structure for a hobby. He asked if there was a possibility that the structure or the equipment in the structure could be used for any kind of commercial venture? He said the Zoning Ordinance does not allow that particular type of thing to happen on a private residence.

Mr. McCarthy stated he had no desire to operate a business from his home. He said he has two other businesses and he was trying to get away from his business. He said this was a hobby he has been doing for years. He said wood working took a tremendous amount of space because most of the lumber was 10, 12, or 14 feet long. He said he had no desire to build furniture or sell furniture.

Mr. Day asked what was he going to do here?

Mr. McCarthy stated he builds different things for his wife to use personally. He said this was a personal hobby. He said he did not have anything specific that he had right now. However, if you have a lathe and several table saws or planers it took a lot of area to work with some of the equipment or materials because it was so spread out. The more space you have the easier it was to work. He said he did not want to have to pull it out onto the driveway. He said he felt that was something his neighbors did not want to see. He said he has tried to make the addition where it was not visible to his neighbors.

Mr. Day asked if it could be smaller?

Mr. McCarthy stated no. He said if it were smaller then he would have to roll equipment and materials out onto the driveway. Again, he has no desire to get into another business. He said this was for relaxation and just a hobby.

Mr. Noha stated if the petitioner attached the addition by a breezeway of some sort then he would not have to come before the Board.

Mrs. Burke stated that was correct. She said it would be considered a part of the main structure, therefore he would not be limited to the 900 square feet.

Mr. Noha asked if the lot was large enough for the petitioner to subdivide and have the same structure with a kitchen in it?

Mrs. Burke stated yes, based on the zoning district which was R1-A. She said it far exceeded the requirement.

Mr. Felder stated they could run a subdivision line between the houses and it would be 120 X 100 which would be 12,000 square feet.

Mr. Noha asked the petitioner if he wanted the addition detached because of aesthetics?

Mr. McCarthy stated he felt if it was attached to the garage it would take away from the looks of the house and neighborhood. He said he felt it looked better detached away from the house.

Mr. Noha asked if it was a single story or two story?

Mr. McCarthy stated single story with attic space.

Mr. Noha stated he felt if it was larger than the garage then he agreed that it would not make sense to connect it because of aesthetics.

Mr. Felder stated the proposed addition was larger than the garage because of the same pitch of the roof it would be taller because it was 36 feet versus 21 feet.

Mr. Noha asked if he was correct that if the petitioner moved the building to the river side he would not need a variance?

Mrs. Burke stated correct. She said as long as the petitioner stayed out of the setbacks and at the rear. She said if the petitioner moved it to the front of the property then you get the 900 square feet.

CZBA Action: **Mr. Day** made a motion that the Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals approve the petition as submitted based upon a finding that the relief granted would not cause substantial detriment to the public good. **Mr. Watford** seconded the motion and it was passed 4 – 1. Opposed to the motion was **Mr. Murphy**.

**RE: Petition of Katherine Bart
B-070420-49518-1
921 Mims Street**

Present for the petition was Bart Redmond and Katherine Bart.

Mrs. Burke gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of a 20 foot front yard setback variance from the 35 foot front yard setback requirement of Section 4-6.1 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance in order to construct a single family residential structure. The subject property, located at 921 Mims Street, is zoned R-1/ EO (One-Family Residential/ Environmental Overlay).

Findings

1. Section 4-6.1 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance requires a minimum front yard setback of 35 feet.

2. The subject parcel has a width of 50 feet and a depth of 93 feet, with 4,650 square feet in lot area. The Ordinance requires a minimum lot width of 75 feet and a minimum lot area of 15,000 square feet for an R-1 zoned parcel that is served by public water and an individual septic tank. The parcel is a nonconforming lot of record.
3. The petitioner is seeking a 20 foot front yard setback variance in order to construct a single family residence within 15 feet of the front yard property line.
4. In accordance with Section 10-6.3 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance, the Board of Appeals may authorize upon appeal in specific cases such variance from the terms of the regulations as will not be contrary to the public interest where owing to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the provisions will, in an individual case, result in unnecessary hardship, so that the spirit of the regulations will be observed, public safety and welfare secured, and substantial justice done. Such variance may be granted in an individual case upon a finding by the Board of Appeals that:

- a. **There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property in question because of its size, shape, or topography.**

The parcel is a nonconforming lot of record that is deficient in regards to lot area and width.

- b. **The application of these regulations to this particular piece of property would create an unnecessary hardship.**

Based on the site plan submitted by the applicant, it appears that strict application of these regulations may create an unnecessary hardship in that there would not be adequate area for the septic field in the rear yard.

- c. **Such conditions are peculiar to the particular piece of property involved.**

The conditions described above are peculiar to the subject property.

- d. **Relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good, or impair the purposes and intent of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance.**

Relief, if granted, would most likely not cause substantial detriment to the public good.

Summary of Findings

All of the conditions necessary for granting a 20 foot front yard setback variance appear to be met.

Mr. Day asked Staff if she was saying the lot was unusable if the petitioner was held to the zoning requirements?

Mrs. Burke stated it would not be unusable, however she felt what the petitioner was requesting and the size of the house it was not excessive.

Mr. Redmond stated his mother owned 3½ lots and the existing house was on 2½. He said on the remaining lot they wanted to put a garage apartment. He said he went to the Health Department and got septic tank approval as well as he has received soil sign test approval. He said the Health Department told him what he was bound to that so that was where the septic tank drain field came from.

Mr. Day stated there was a report from the Environmental Technology Company called Bradshaw and there was an item in the report that said due to the water table there was a high possibility of failure for conventional systems.

Mr. Redmond stated what that meant was you could not use a standard drain field with a rock in it. He said they would have to use an infield trader system and have a mound system where the property was built up 3 feet. He said you would scrape 1 foot of dirt out and put 3 foot back in of new soil. The mound system has to be sloped and could not be any closer to the back or side line than 5 feet.

Mr. Day asked how tall was the mound?

Mr. Redmond stated 24 inches.

Mr. Day asked where was the entrance to the building?

Mr. Redmond stated it will be on Mims Street.

Mr. Day asked if there will be a driveway?

Mr. Redmond stated yes.

Mr. Day stated he was concerned that an automobile was 18 feet long. He said if the house has a setback of 15 feet from Mims Street or the right-of-way and you park an automobile in front of the house the automobile would be hanging over the property line. He said he felt the driveway would have to be on the side.

Mr. Noha stated he felt the petitioner would not be able to do that because it would not fit because it was wider than it was deep.

Mr. Day stated if the Board asked them to do the driveway in from the side then they were bringing in another lot that was not combined in with this house. Therefore, they would have to do something legally to give them right-of-way through that additional lot and tie the two pieces of property together.

Ms. Katherine Bart stated her grandson will live in the garage apartment. She asked if she could grant him egress and ingress into the existing drive?

Mr. Day stated he felt she probably could but he felt they would have to do it legally. He said somehow the entrance to the driveway had to be tied to the house so that the other lot could not ever be sold. He said basically they would have to combine two lots.

Mr. Noha stated he felt if they combined the two lots into one lot they would not be able to have two kitchens. He said they would have to have one kitchen.

Mr. Felder asked if the house had to be 30 feet deep? He said they could park in 22 feet. He said if they made the house 22 feet deep then they would have 23 feet from the street to the front of the garage.

Mr. Redmond stated that was a possibility. He said the deck was cantilevered and if he took off 4 feet off the front he felt they could achieve that.

Mr. Felder stated when they visited the site the other houses in the area were within 15 feet of their property line.

Mrs. Burke stated the requirement was 9 feet wide and 18 feet long for parking space.

Mr. Redmond stated they could achieve 18 or 19 feet.

Mr. Day asked what was the side yard setback?

Mrs. Burke stated 7 feet was required.

CZBA Action: **Mr. Felder** made a motion that the Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals deny the petition as submitted and approve a 17 foot front yard setback variance. **Mr. Day** seconded the motion and it was passed 4 – 1. Opposed to the motion was **Mr. Noha**.

**RE: Petition of Gerry Cowart, For
Dr. & Mrs. Jay Spencer
B-070420-49677-1
44 Modena Island Drive**

Present for the petition was Gerry Cowart.

Mrs. Burke gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of a ten foot front yard setback variance from the 35 foot front yard setback requirement of Section 4-6.1 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance in order to construct a single family residential structure. The subject property, located at 44 Modena Island Drive, is zoned R-1/ EO (One-Family Residential/ Environmental Overlay).

Findings

1. The Modena, Phase II subdivision plat, which includes the subject property, was approved in 1988 with a 35 foot front yard setback requirement.
2. The subject parcel has a width of approximately 120 feet and a depth of approximately 163 feet. Per the applicant's site plan, the subject property is 22,898 square feet in size. The lot is a conforming lot of record.
3. The petitioner is seeking a ten foot front yard setback variance in order to construct a single family residence, specifically a detached garage, within 25 feet of the front yard

property line.

4. In accordance with Section 10-6.3 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance, the Board of Appeals may authorize upon appeal in specific cases such variance from the terms of the regulations as will not be contrary to the public interest where owing to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the provisions will, in an individual case, result in unnecessary hardship, so that the spirit of the regulations will be observed, public safety and welfare secured, and substantial justice done. Such variance may be granted in an individual case upon a finding by the Board of Appeals that:

- a. There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property in question because of its size, shape, or topography.**

There are no extraordinary or exceptional conditions pertaining to the subject property. The parcel is a conforming lot of record that is rectangular in shape.

- b. The application of these regulations to this particular piece of property would create an unnecessary hardship.**

Strict application of the regulations of the district would not cause unnecessary hardship. There appears to be adequate area on site to construct the proposed structures without encroaching into any established setbacks.

- c. Such conditions are peculiar to the particular piece of property involved.**

The conditions described above are not peculiar to the subject property.

- d. Relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good, or impair the purposes and intent of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance.**

Relief, if granted, would most likely not cause substantial detriment to the public good. However, it would appear to be in conflict with the intent and purposes of the Ordinance.

Summary of Findings

All of the conditions necessary for granting a ten foot front yard setback variance appear not to be met.

Mr. Cowart stated they originally thought this was a 30 foot setback and found out it was a 35 foot setback. He said they had the 5 feet of play between the house and felt they did not want to squeeze to begin with but they went ahead and did that so that they were only asking for 5 feet after they corrected the site plan setback. He said the lot was a standard lot. He said part of what was happening was the unique cut in into the marsh and the way the cul-de-sac cut in they had a long deep side but the two sides were not parallel. He said he did not want to say the shape of the lot was a hardship but it was a factor. The other thing was how large the other lots were around this lot and the two lots across the street were owned by the same owner and they have built and kind of ignored the setbacks between the two so they could build a bigger house on the lot across the street. It was not a subdivision of small houses and this was not a

huge house. He said the house was 3200 s.f. and 2200 s.f. was the footprint of the main body. He said they could have put the garage on the other side of the lot where there was plenty of room but it would have put the back of the garage to the public as they approach the cul-de-sac. He said their original concept in analyzing the lot was they wanted to have the garage on the far side of the lot as you approached. The fact that the cul-de-sac cuts into the lot you could see what was giving them a problem. He said they have brought the garage as close as they could to the house and still keep the sense that the garage was a subset to the main building and not connect the two directly. He said they felt that was an aesthetic decision as well.

Mr. Felder asked how far from the front porch to the back face of the garage?

Mr. Cowart stated approximately 9 feet.

Mr. Felder asked if the little projection on the porch a low country styled house so that the little projection on the porch was the main body?

Mr. Cowart stated yes, it was a low country porch that wrapped around.

Mr. Noha asked if there was a reason that they did not shift the garage or turn it clockwise?

Mr. Cowart stated yes. He said it pulled the garage further out in front of the house.

Mr. Noha stated he was concerned that they were trying to build too large of a structure for the property. He said he really felt there was another way this could be done.

Mr. Murphy asked if they could pull it closer to the house?

Mr. Cowart stated if they pulled it closer to the house then it would change the design to a connected house and garage. He said they would lose the beauty of the wrap around porch. He said they felt it was more of an aesthetic desire to have it where it was than it was a functional and size relationship. Pulling the garage further in front of the house, putting it on the other side of the house or rotating it out in front of the house out of aligned with the house were all things in the architects opinion diminished the beauty of the house and created a less handsome streetscape.

Mr. Noha stated for clarification this was not connected by a breezeway or any sort of roof line. He said it was strictly detached from the garage.

Mr. Cowart stated it was a detached garage. He said it was not connected by a breezeway. The possibility to connect it with a breezeway exists and there has been discussion of that.

Mr. Noha stated it seemed like it would give more sight of that less side if it were rotated somewhat.

Mr. Felder stated he felt the front property line should be respected. He asked if the two 7 inch Live oaks could be moved if the house shifted back so that the little brick stoop goes back into the backyard setback?

Mr. Cowart stated yes, but they could lose them also because they were not significant trees.

Mr. Felder stated he felt it would be better if the back brick step went over the back setback than have the garage go closer to the street.

Mr. Cowart stated that was a consideration. He said he guessed with everything that has been in the paper about the 50 foot marsh setback they felt that may not be the best thing to do.

Mr. Felder asked if a brick stoop could go into the backyard over the setback line?

Mrs. Burke stated she understood correctly the interpretation has been made at building inspections it would have to be wood. She said the Board could reduce the front setback variance request but they could not change it to a rear setback. She said the petitioner would have to continue it and it be readvertised.

Mr. Noha stated or they could eliminate the steps. He said it also looked that they could move them more northerly to the end of the porch.

Mr. Day stated he felt the easiest thing was to lose them because you have a set of steps on this end. He said he would like to either see the garage turned so that they were not encroaching on the front setback or lose the steps on the back and push the whole structure back to where they were not encroaching on any setbacks. He said he felt this could be achieved because they had enough lot size that they could eliminate the need for a variance.

Mr. Cowart stated their logic was they rather not push it towards the marsh. He said they also did not think about the political ramifications of granting a variance.

Mr. Day stated as it has been said in the past the laws were there for a reason. He said he liked to look at it and say give him a good reason to grant a variance. He said he felt they have not given a good reason for a variance to be granted.

Mr. Felder asked the petitioner if they wanted a continuance?

Mr. Cowart stated no.

CZBA Action: **Mr. Day made a motion that the Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals deny the petition based on relief, if granted, would cause substantial detriment to the public good, or impair the purposes and intent of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Murphy seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.**

**RE: Petition of Joel Cedillo
B-070423-31240-1
4317 Ogeechee Road**

Present for the petition was Joel Cedillo.

Mrs. Burke gave the following Staff report.

The petitioner is requesting approval of a 15 foot side yard setback variance from the 20 foot side yard setback requirement of Section 4-6.1 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance in order to construct an addition to an existing commercial structure. The subject property, located at 4317 Ogeechee Road, is zoned P-B (Planned-Business).

Findings

1. Section 4-6.1 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance requires that no structure shall be located closer than 20 feet from any right-of-way line.
2. The subject parcel has a width of approximately 200 feet and an approximate depth of 160 feet, resulting in a lot area of 32,000 square feet. The parcel is a conforming lot of record.
3. The petitioner is seeking a 15 foot front yard setback variance in order to construct an addition to an existing commercial structure five feet from the property line.
4. In accordance with Section 10-6.3 of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance, the Board of Appeals may authorize upon appeal in specific cases such variance from the terms of the regulations as will not be contrary to the public interest where owing to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the provisions will, in an individual case, result in unnecessary hardship, so that the spirit of the regulations will be observed, public safety and welfare secured, and substantial justice done. Such variance may be granted in an individual case upon a finding by the Board of Appeals that:

- a. **There are extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to the particular piece of property in question because of its size, shape, or topography.**

There are no extraordinary or exceptional conditions pertaining to the subject property. The parcel is a conforming lot of record that is square in shape.

- b. **The application of these regulations to this particular piece of property would create an unnecessary hardship.**

Strict application of the regulations of the district would not cause an unnecessary hardship. In fact, there appears to be adequate area on site for the applicant to construct an addition onto the existing structure without encroaching into the established setback.

- c. **Such conditions are peculiar to the particular piece of property involved.**

The conditions described above are not peculiar to the subject property.

- d. **Relief, if granted, would not cause substantial detriment to the public good, or impair the purposes and intent of the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance.**

Relief, if granted, would most likely not cause substantial detriment to the public good. However, it would appear to be in conflict with the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance.

Summary of Findings

All of the conditions necessary for granting a 15 foot side yard setback variance appear not to be met.

Mr. Cedillo stated they were requesting a variance because they felt this portion of the property that they want to use to face the heavy traffic for the business on Chatham Parkway and Ogeechee was unusable for a showroom. He said they would put all glass where the showroom would be. He said they felt this would allow them to compete with the other dealerships in Savannah.

Mr. Noha asked how long has the existing building been there?

Mr. Cedillo stated approximately since 1968.

Mr. Noha stated the roadway went in about 5 or 10 years ago. He said if they were adding a showroom space which he understood they wanted the visibility on that road and it has an Ogeechee Road address but to grant a variance for showroom space and there was no other need other than visibility, he was concerned about that. He said maybe they could redesign what they had and still achieve their goal. He asked what did they use the other building for?

Mr. Cedillo stated it was used for storage as well as the shop. He said the other structure on the property was used for storage. He said the area was well used with the crates of motorcycles and ATV's that come in.

Mr. Noha asked if they could not take the backend of the yellow part and extend it the same depth as it was currently?

Mr. Cedillo stated there was a fence on the property that he took down because they realized there was a variance problem. He said that portion to the property line was 8 feet. He said from there, they were going to go 20 feet back. He said the showroom area was very narrow. He said a motorcycle was approximately 10 feet in length. He said nineteen motorcycles was all they would be able to put along the front side which would be most of the showroom. He said that was why they felt a need to expand.

Mr. Felder asked if they built the addition as shown would they also try to park in front of the showroom?

Mr. Cedillo stated no. He said Mr. Beasley proposed if they got the variance that whole area he would landscape. He said parking would only be on one side. The fence line will come back 25 feet which would increase the parking. He said the exterior of the building will be upgraded to match the other buildings in the area.

Mr. Noha asked how much buildable space was between the rear of the existing building and the ditch?

Mr. Cedillo stated 40 feet.

Mr. Noha stated he was concerned that they were asking for more than half of what was allowed.

Mr. Watford asked if the driveway was going to remain in the back of the building?

Mr. Cedillo stated no, it will be eliminated.

Mr. Watford stated if they put the showroom on the left side as proposed to look in the windows and see their merchandise you would be going out Chatham Parkway. He said there will not be a way for people to turn into it unless they try to come in off of Highway 17.

Mr. Day stated he felt if the building was built at an angle with glass they would see it better. He said he felt they needed to think their design out better.

Mr. Watford stated if people were going in the direction of the truck as shown on the photograph once you make the turn and you look in the window and see something you want to stop and look at you have to go another ¼ mile before you could turn around.

Mr. Cedillo stated he asked Mr. Beasley about doing it at an angle but they felt it did not seem to conform with the building.

Mr. Felder stated he understood their rationale. Unfortunately, between 1968 and now they have an eight lane road at their front door and they have a four lane road at their side door. He said he felt it was too close to the road.

Mr. Day stated one of things they may want to think about was taking the L-shaped off, extend it over and put all the parking on that side. He said that way they could have all glass basically in two directions which would give them exposure from both ways. He said he felt they needed to rethink their design. He said he felt the petitioner may want to request a continuance.

Mr. Felder stated that they may want to hire a Civil Engineer to help them work out their issues.

Mr. Cedillo stated they would like to request a continuance.

CZBA Action: Mr. Day made a motion that the Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals **continue** the petition. Mr. Felder seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

RE: Minutes

1. Approval CZBA Meeting Minutes – April 24, 2007

CZBA Action: Mr. Day made a motion that the Chatham County Zoning Board of Appeals **approve the minutes of April 24, 2007 as submitted.** Mr. Watford seconded the motion and it was unanimously passed.

RE: Other Business

Mr. Noha stated there was a letter written by Staff and it has been mailed to Commissioner Stone. He said they asked for her assistance with the marsh setback for 25 and 50 feet.

Mrs. Burke stated there was a memo sent out about Board training that was going to be June 8. She said that is going to be rescheduled. She said it may be late Summer or early Fall when the training will be scheduled.

Mr. Watford asked if they could update the County applications. He said the County application had old information with regards to Commissioners names.

Mrs. Burke stated Building and Regulatory Services is aware of it. She said she will mention it to Mr. Sebek again.

Mr. Day stated the 900 square feet needed to be looked at. He said he felt they have put a single footprint on all lot sizes and it did not make sense. He said he did not know if it needed to be a Text Amendment or made a part of the rewrite of the ordinance.

Mrs. Burke stated the Staff that is involved of the rewrite of the ordinance was aware of that. She said if it was something the Board felt needed to be changed sooner then Staff may be able to take it through another internal process that may be quicker than the rewrite of the ordinance. She said she will also do research to see how other ordinances handled accessory structures and get feedback from the Board as well.

Mr. Felder suggested that Staff look beyond other ordinances. He said Palmetto Bluff, Old Field, and Ford Plantation Architectural Guidelines deals with accessory structures and their proportion to the main house.

RE: Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the County Zoning Board of Appeals, the meeting was adjourned approximately 10:35 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Deborah Burke,
Assistant Secretary

DB:ca